arXiv:1611.04732v1 [math.AC] 15 Nov 2016

BETTI NUMBERS OF CERTAIN SUM IDEALS

JOYDIP SAHA, INDRANATH SENGUPTA, AND GAURAB TRIPATHI

ABSTRACT. In this paper we compute the Betti numbers for ideals of the form $I_1(XY) + J$, where X and Y are matrices and J is the ideal generated by the 2×2 minors of the matrix consisting of any two rows of X.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let K be a field and $\{x_{ij};\, 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$, $\{y_j;\, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ be indeterminates over K; $n \geq 2$. Let $R := K[x_{ij}, y_j]$ denote the polynomial algebra over K. Let X denote an $n \times n$ matrix such that its entries belong to the ideal $\langle\{x_{ij};\, 1 \leq i \leq n,\, 1 \leq j \leq n\}\rangle$. Let $Y = (y_j)_{n\times 1}$ be the $n \times 1$ column matrix. Let $I_1(XY)$ denote the ideal generated by the polynomials $g_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_{ji}y_i$, $j = 1, \ldots, n$, which are the 1×1 minors or entries of the $n \times n$ matrix XY. The primality, primary decomposition and Betti numbers of ideals of the form $I_1(XY)$ have been studied in [9] and [10], with the help of Gröbner bases for $I_1(XY)$.

Ideals of the form $I_1(XY) + J$ are particularly interesting because they occur in several geometric considerations like linkage and generic residual intersection of polynomial ideals, especially in the context of syzygies. Bruns-Kustin-Miller [1] resolved the ideal $I_1(XY)+I_{\min(m,n)}(X)$, where X is a generic $m\times n$ matrix and Y is a generic $n\times 1$ matrix. Johnson-McLoud [5] proved certain properties for the ideals of the form $I_1(XY) + I_2(X)$, where X is a generic symmetric matrix and Y is either generic or generic alternating.

We say that I and J intersect *transversally* if $I \cap J = IJ$. Suppose that $\mathbb{F}_\cdot$ resolves R/I and $\mathbb{G}_\cdot$ resolves R/J minimally. It is interesting to note that if I and J intersect transversally, then the tensor product complex $\mathbb{F} \otimes_R \mathbb{G}$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13D02; Secondary 13C40, 13P10, 13D07.

Key words and phrases. Gröbner basis, Betti numbers, transversal intersection, mapping cone.

The first author thanks UGC for the Senior Research Fellowship.

The second author is the corresponding author, who is supported by the the research project EMR/2015/000776 sponsored by the SERB, Government of India.

The third author thanks CSIR for the Senior Research Fellowship.

resolves $R/I + J$ minimally; see Lemma 3.7. Therefore, it is useful to know if two ideals intersect transversally, especially when one is trying to compute minimal free resolutions and Betti numbers for ideals of the form $I + J$, through iterated techniques; see [4].

2. Notation and the Main Theorem

- If X is generic and $i < j$; let $\widetilde{X}_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{i1} & x_{i2} & \cdots & x_{in} \\ x_{j1} & x_{j2} & \cdots & x_{jn} \end{pmatrix}$.
- If X is generic symmetric and $i < j$; let
$$\widetilde{X}_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1i} & \cdots & x_{ii} & \cdots & x_{ij} & \cdots & x_{in} \\ x_{1j} & \cdots & x_{ij} & \cdots & x_{jj} & \cdots & x_{jn} \end{pmatrix}.$$
- Let $\mathcal{G}_{ij}$ denote the set of all 2×2 minors of $\widetilde{X}_{ij}$.
- $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})$ denote the ideal generated $\mathcal{G}_{ij}$.

Our aim in this paper is to prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2.1. *Let $X = (x_{ij})$ be either the generic or the generic symmetric matrix of order n. Let $1 \leq i < j \leq n$.*

(1) The total Betti numbers for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j \rangle$ are given by $b_0 = 1$, $b_1 = \binom{n}{2} + 2$, $b_2 = 2\binom{n}{3} + n$, $b_{i+1} = i\binom{n}{i+1} + (i-2)\binom{n}{i}$, for $2 \leq i \leq n-2$ and $b_n = n - 2$.

(2) Let $1 \leq k \leq n-2$. Let $\beta_{k,p}$ denote the p-th total Betti number for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j, g_{l_1}, \ldots, g_{l_k} \rangle$, such that $1 \leq l_1 < \ldots < l_k \leq n$ and l_t is the smallest in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i, j, l_1, \ldots, l_{t-1}\}$, for every $1 \leq t \leq k$. They are given by $\beta_{k,0} = 1$, $\beta_{k,p} = \beta_{k-1,p-1} + \beta_{k-1,p}$ for $1 \leq p \leq n + k - 1$ and $\beta_{k,n+k} = n - 2$.

In particular, the total Betti numbers for the ideal $I_1(XY) + I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})$ are $\beta_{n-2,0}, \beta_{n-2,1}, \ldots, \beta_{n-2,2n-2}$.

3. Preliminaries

3.1. **Determinantal Ideals.** We recall some useful results on determinantal ideals pertaining to our work. We refer to [2], [3], [8] for detailed discussions on these.

Theorem 3.1. *Let K be a field and let $x_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$ be indeterminates over K. Let $A = (x_{ij})$ be the $m \times n$ matrix of indeterminates and $I_m(A)$ denotes the ideal generated by the maximal minors of A. The set of maximal minors of A is a universal Gröbner basis for the ideal $I_m(A)$.*

Proof. See [2]. □

The Eagon-Northcott Complex. We present the relevant portion from the book [3] here. Let $F = R^f$ and $G = R^g$ be free modules of finite rank over the polynomial ring R. The *Eagon-Northcott complex* of a map $\alpha : F \longrightarrow G$ (or that of a matrix A representing α) is a complex

$$EN(\alpha) : 0 \to (Sym_{f-g}G)^* \otimes \wedge^f F \xrightarrow{d_{f-g+1}} (Sym_{f-g-1}G)^* \otimes \wedge^{f-1} F \xrightarrow{d_{f-g}}$$
$$\cdots \longrightarrow (Sym_2 G)^* \otimes \wedge^{g+2} F \xrightarrow{d_3} G^* \otimes \wedge^{g+1} F \overset{d_2}{\wedge}{}^g F \xrightarrow{\wedge^g \alpha} \wedge^g G.$$

Here $Sym_k G$ is the k-th symmetric power of G and $M^* = \mathrm{Hom}_R(M, R)$. The map d_j are defined as follows. First we define a diagonal map

$$\begin{aligned} (Sym_k G)^* &\to G^* \otimes (Sym_{k-1}G)^* \\ u &\mapsto \sum_i u_i^{'} \otimes u_i^{''} \end{aligned}$$

as the dual of the multiplication map $G \otimes Sym_{k-1}G \longrightarrow Sym_k G$ in the symmetric algebra of G. Next we define an analogous diagonal map

$$\begin{aligned} \wedge^k F &\longrightarrow F \otimes \wedge^{k-1} F \\ v &\mapsto \sum_i v_i^{'} \otimes v_i^{''} \end{aligned}$$

as the dual of the multiplication in the exterior algebra of F^*.

Theorem 3.2 (Eagon-Northcott)**.** *The Eagon-Northcott complex is a free resolution of $R/I_g(\alpha)$ iff grade$(I_g(\alpha)) = f - g + 1$ where $I_g(\alpha)$ denotes the $g \times g$ minors of the matrix A representing α.*

Proof. See [3]. □

3.2. **Mapping Cone.** We present the relevant portion from the book [8] here. Let R be the polynomial ring. Let $\phi_\cdot : (U_\cdot, d_\cdot) \to (U_\cdot^{'}, d_\cdot^{'})$ be a map of complexes of finitely generated R-modules. The mapping cone of $\phi_\cdot$ is the complex $W_\cdot$ with differential $\delta_\cdot$ defined as follows. Let $W_i = U_{i-1} \oplus U_i^{'}$, with $\delta|_{U_{i-1}} = -d + \phi : U_{i-1} \longrightarrow U_{i-2} \oplus U_{i-1}^{'}$ and $\delta|_{U_i^{'}} = d^{'} : U_i^{'} \to U_{i-1}^{'}$ for each i.

Theorem 3.3. *Let M be an ideal minimally generated by the polynomials $f_1, \ldots, f_r$. Set $M_i = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_i \rangle$, for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Thus, $M = M_r$. For each $i \geq 1$, we have the short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow S/(M_i : f_{i+1}) \xrightarrow{f_{i+1}} S/M_i \longrightarrow S/M_{i+1} \longrightarrow 0.$$

If resolutions of S/M_i and $S/(M_i : f_{i+1})$ are known then we can construct a resolution of S/M_{i+1} by the mapping cone construction.

Proof. See Construction 27.3 in [8]. □

3.3. **Gröbner basis and transversal intersection of Ideals.**

Lemma 3.4. *Let $h_1, h_2 \cdots, h_n \in R$ be such that with respect to a suitable monomial order on R, the leading terms of them are mutually coprime. Then, $h_1, h_2 \cdots, h_n$ is a regular sequence in R.*

Proof. . See Lemma 4.3 in [9]. □

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose that X is either generic or generic symmetric. The set $\mathcal{G}_{ij}$ is a Gröbner basis for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})$, with respect a suitable monomial order.*

Proof. We choose the lexicographic monomial order given by the following ordering among the variables: $x_{st} > x_{s't'}$ if $(s^{'}, t^{'}) > (s, t)$ and $y_n > y_{n-1} > \cdots, y_1 > x_{st}$ for all s, t. We now apply Lemma 4.2 in [9] for the matrix X^t and for $k = 2$. □

Definition 1. Let $T \subset R$ be a set of monomials. We define

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{supp}(T) &= \{(i,j,0) \mid x_{ij} \text{ divides } m \text{ for some } m \in T\} \cup \\ &\quad \{(0,0,k) \mid y_k \text{ divides } m \text{ for some } m \in T\}.\end{aligned}$$

If $T = \{m\}$, then we write supp(m) instead of supp$(\{m\})$.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $>$ be a monomial ordering on R. Let I and J be ideals in R, such that $m(I)$ and $m(J)$ denote unique minimal generating sets for their leading ideals* Lt(I) *and* Lt(J) *respectively. Then, $I \cap J = IJ$ if $\operatorname{supp}(m(I)) \cap \operatorname{supp}(m(J)) = \emptyset$. In other words, the ideals I and J intersect transversally if the set of variables occurring in the set $m(I)$ is disjointed from the the set of variables occurring in the set $m(J)$.*

Proof. Let $f \in I \cap J$; we show that $f \in IJ$. Now $f \in I \cap J$ implies that $f \in I$ and therefore Lt$(f) \in$ Lt(I). Hence, $m_i \in m(I)$ such that $m_i \mid$ Lt(f). Similarly, there exists monomial $m_j \in m(J)$ such that $m_j \mid$ Lt(f). Given that m_i and m_j are of disjoint support, we have $m_i m_j \mid$ Lt(f) and this proves that Lt$(f) \in$ Lt(IJ). We replace f by $f - \frac{\text{Lt}(f)}{m_i m_j}$. Now the proof follows by induction since, Lt $\left(f - \frac{\text{Lt}(f)}{m_i m_j}\right) <$ Lt(f). □

3.4. **Homological Lemmas.**

Lemma 3.7. *Let I and J be graded ideals in a graded ring R, such that $I \cap J = I \cdot J$. Suppose that $\mathbb{F}_.$ and $\mathbb{G}_.$ are minimal free resolutions of I and J respectively. Then $\mathbb{F}_. \otimes \mathbb{G}_.$ is a minimal free resolution for the graded ideal $I + J$.*

Proof. Consider the short exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow R \longrightarrow R/I \longrightarrow 0$ and tensor it with R/J over R. We get the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathrm{Tor}^1(R/I, R/J) \longrightarrow I/I \cdot J \longrightarrow R/J \longrightarrow R/I + J \longrightarrow 0.$$

The terms on the left are 0 since R is a flat R module. Moreover, the kernel of the map from $I/I \cdot J \longrightarrow R/J$ is $I \cap J/I \cdot J$. Therefore $\mathrm{Tor}^1(R/I, R/J) = 0$ if and only if $I \cap J = I \cdot J$. By the corollary 1 of theorem 3 proved in [6], $\mathrm{Tor}^1(R/I, R/J) = 0$ implies that $\mathrm{Tor}^i(R/I, R/J) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$. Therefore, $H_i(\mathbb{F}_. \otimes \mathbb{G}_.) \simeq \mathrm{Tor}^{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{R/I}, \mathrm{R/J}) \simeq 0$ for all $i \geq 1$ and $H_0(\mathbb{F}_. \otimes \mathbb{G}_.) \simeq R/I + J$. This proves that $\mathbb{F}_. \otimes \mathbb{G}_.$ resolves $I + J$. The resolution is minimal since $\mathbb{F}_.$ and $\mathbb{G}_.$ are minimal. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let*

$$R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{A_1} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{A_2} R^{a_3}$$

be an exact sequence of free modules. Let Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 be invertible matrices of sizes a_1, a_2, a_3 respectively. Then,

$$R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{Q_2^{-1}A_1Q_1} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{Q_3^{-1}A_2Q_2} R^{a_3}$$

is also an exact sequence of free modules.

Proof. The following diagram is a commutative diagram is free modules and the vertical maps are isomorphisms:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} R^{a_1} & \xrightarrow{A_1} & R^{a_2} & \xrightarrow{A_2} & R^{a_3} \\ \uparrow{\scriptstyle Q_1} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle Q_2} & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle Q_3} \\ R^{a_1} & \xrightarrow{Q_2^{-1}A_1Q_1} & R^{a_2} & \xrightarrow{Q_3^{-1}A_2Q_2} & R^{a_3} \end{array}$$

Therefore, $R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{Q_2^{-1}A_1Q_1} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{Q_3^{-1}A_2Q_2} R^{a_3}$ is exact since $R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{A_1} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{A_2} R^{a_3}$ is exact. □

Corollary 3.9. *Let*

$$R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{C} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{B} R^{a_3} \xrightarrow{A} R^{a_4}$$

be an exact sequence of free modules. Let P_1, P_2, P_3 be invertible matrices of sizes a_1, a_2, a_3 respectively. Then,

$$R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{P_2^{-1}CP_1} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{BP_2} R^{a_3} \xrightarrow{AP_3^{-1}} R^{a_4}$$

is also an exact sequence of free modules.

Proof. Consider the sequence $R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{C} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{B} R^{a_3}$. If we take $Q_1 = P_1, Q_2 = P_2$ and $Q_3 = I$ and apply Lemma **??**, we get that the sequence $R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{P_2^{-1}CP_1} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{BP_2} R^{a_3}$ is exact. We further note that the entire sequence $R^{a_1} \xrightarrow{P_2^{-1}CP_1} R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{BP_2} R^{a_3} \xrightarrow{A} R^{a_4}$ is exact as well, since $\mathrm{Im}(B) = \mathrm{Im}(BP_2)$ and P_2 is invertible. Let us now consider the sequence $R^{a_2} \xrightarrow{BP_2} R^{a_3} \xrightarrow{A} R^{a_4}$. We take $Q_1 = Q_3 = I$, $Q_2 = P_3^{-1}$ and apply Lemma 2.3 to arrive at our conclusion. □

Lemma 3.10. *Let*

$$\cdots \longrightarrow R^{\beta_{n+1}} \xrightarrow{A_{n+1}} R^{\beta_n} \xrightarrow{A_n} R^{\beta_{n-1}} \xrightarrow{A_{n-1}} R^{\beta_{n-2}} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

be an exact sequence of free R modules. Let a_{ij} denote the (i, j)-th entry of A_n. Suppose that $a_{lm} = \pm 1$ for some l and m, $a_{li} = 0$ for $i \neq m$ and $a_{jm} = 0$ for $j \neq l$. Let A'_{n+1} be the matrix obtained by deleting the m-th row from A_{n+1}, A'_{n-1} the matrix obtained by deleting the l-th column from A_{n-1} and A'_n the matrix obtained by deleting the l-th row and m-th column from A_n. Then, the sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow R^{\beta_{n+1}} \xrightarrow{A'_{n+1}} R^{\beta_n - 1} \xrightarrow{A'_n} R^{\beta_{n-1} - 1} \xrightarrow{A'_{n-1}} R^{\beta_{n-2}} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

is exact.

Proof. The fact that the latter sequence is a complex is self evident. We need to prove its exactness. By the previous lemma we may assume that $l = m = 1$, for we choose elementary matrices to permute rows and columns and these matrices are always invertible. Now, due to exactness of the first complex we have $A_{n-1}A_n = 0$. This implies that the first column of $A_{n-1} = 0$, which implies that $\mathrm{Im}(A_{n-1}) = \mathrm{Im}(A'_{n-1})$. Therefore, the right exactness of A_{n+1} is preserved. By a similar argument we can prove that the left exactness of A'_{n+1} is preserved.

Let $(\underline{\mathbf{x}})$ denote a tuple with entries from R. If $(\underline{\mathbf{x}}) \in \ker(A'_n)$, then $(0, \underline{\mathbf{x}}) \in \ker(A_n)$. There exists $\left(\underline{\mathbf{y}}\right) \in R^{\beta_{n+1}}$ such that $A_{n-1}\left(\underline{\mathbf{y}}\right) = (0, \underline{\mathbf{x}})$. It follows that $A'_{n-1}\left(\underline{\mathbf{y}}\right) = (\underline{\mathbf{x}})$, proving the left exactness of A'_n. By a similar argument we can prove the right exactness of A'_n. □

Lemma 3.11. *Let A be $q \times p$ matrix over R with $A_{ij} = \pm 1$, for some i and j. Let C be a $p \times s$ matrix and B a $r \times q$ matrix over R. There exist an invertible $q \times q$ matrix X and an invertible $p \times p$ matrix Y, such that*

(i) $(XAY)_{kj} = \delta_{ki}$ *and* $(XAY)_{ik} = \delta_{jk}$*, that is*

$$XAY = \begin{pmatrix} \cdots & 0 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0\cdots 0 & 1 & 0\cdots 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \cdots & 0 & \cdots \\ \cdots & 0 & \cdots \end{pmatrix}; \quad 1 \quad \text{at the} \quad (i,j)-\text{th spot.}$$

(ii) $(Y^{-1}C)_{kl} = C_{kl}$ *for* $k \neq j$ *and* $(Y^{-1}C)_{jl} = C_{jl} + \sum_{t\neq i}(a_{it})C_{tl}$

(iii) $(BX^{-1})_{kl} = B_{kl}$ *for* $l \neq i$ *and* $(BX^{-1})_{ki} = B_{ki} + \sum_{t\neq i}(a_{tj})B_{kt}$.

Proof. **(i)** We prove for $a_{ij} = 1$. The other case is similar. We take $Y = \Pi_{k\neq j}E_{jk}(-a_{ik})$ and $X = \Pi_{k\neq i}E_{ki}(-a_{kj})$, where $E_{kl}(\alpha)$ denotes the matrix E with $E_{kl} = \alpha$, $E_{tt} = 1$ and $E_{ut} = 0$ for $u \neq t$ and $(u,t) \neq (k,l)$.

(ii) and **(iii)** are easy to verify. □

Lemma 3.12. *Let A be $q \times p$ matrix, C be a $p \times s$ matrix and B a $r \times q$ matrix over R. The matrices A, B and C satisfy property $\mathcal{P}_{ij}$ if they satisfy the following conditions:*

- $A_{ij} = 1$ *,* $A_{ik} \in \mathfrak{m}$ *for* $k \neq j$ *and* $A_{kj} \in \mathfrak{m}$ *for* $k \neq i$*;*
- $B_{ki} \in \mathfrak{m}$*, for* $1 \leq k \leq r$*;*
- $C_{jl} \in \mathfrak{m}$*, for* $1 \leq l \leq s$.

The matrices XAY, BX^{-1} and $Y^{-1}C$ satisfy property $\mathcal{P}_{ij}$, if A, B, C satisfy property $\mathcal{P}_{ij}$.

Proof. This follows from the above lemma since a_{ik} and a_{kj} belong to $\mathfrak{m}$. □

4. Minimal free resolution of $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j\rangle$

Lemma 4.1. *Let X be generic or generic symmetric. Let $i < j$.*

(i) $\mathrm{ht}(I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})) = n - 1$.

(ii) The Eagon-Northcott complex minimally resolves the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X_{ij}})$.

Proof. **(i)** We show that $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}$, given by $f_k = x_{ik}x_{j,k+1} - x_{jk}x_{i,k+1}$, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ form a regular sequence.

Let us first assume that X is generic. We take the lexicographic monomial order induced by the following ordering among the variables: $x_{i1} > x_{i2} > \cdots > x_{in} > x_{j2} > x_{j3} > \cdots > x_{jn} > x_{j1}$ not appearing in $\widetilde{X}$ and the variables y_k are smaller than x_{j1}. Then, $\mathrm{Lt}(f_k) = x_{ik}x_{j,k+1}$ and hence

$\gcd(\mathrm{Lt}(f_k), \mathrm{Lt}(f_l)) = 1$ for every $k \neq l$. Therefore, $f_1, \ldots, f_{n-1}$ is a regular sequence by Lemma 3.4 and hence $\mathrm{ht}(I_2(\widetilde{X})) \geq n-1$. On the other hand, $\mathrm{ht}(I_2(\widetilde{X})) \leq n-1$, by Theorem [13.10] in [7]. Hence, $\mathrm{ht}(I_2(\widetilde{X})) \leq n-1$.

If X is generic symmetric, then we have to choose the lexicographic monomial order induced by $x_{ii} > x_{ij} > x_{1i} > x_{2i} > \cdots > x_{i-1,i} > x_{i,i+1} > \cdots > x_{in} > x_{jj} > \cdots > \widehat{x_{ij}} > \cdots > x_{j-1,j} > x_{j,j+1} > \cdots > x_{jn}$ and variables x_{kl} not appearing in $\widetilde{X_{ij}}$ and the variables y_p are smaller than x_{jn}. □

(ii) The height of $I_2(\widetilde{X_{ij}})$ is $n-1$, which is the maximum. Hence, the Eagon-Northcott complex minimally resolves the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X_{ij}})$. □

Lemma 4.2. *Let X be generic or generic symmetric. Let $i < j$. Then, $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) \cap \langle g_i \rangle = I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) \cdot \langle g_i \rangle$, that is, the ideals $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})$ and $\langle g_i \rangle$ intersect transversally.*

Proof. Let X be generic. We choose the lexicographic monomial order given by the following ordering among the variables: $x_{st} > x_{s't'}$ if $(s', t') > (s, t)$ and $y_n > y_{n-1} > \cdots > y_1 > x_{st}$ for all s, t. Then, by Lemma 3.5 the set of all 2×2 minors forms a Gröbner basis for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})$. Clearly, the minimal generating set $m(\mathrm{Lt}(I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})))$ doesn't involve the indeterminates x_{in} and y_n, whereas $\mathrm{Lt}(g_i) = x_{in}y_n$. Hence, the supports of $m(\mathrm{Lt}(I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})))$ and $m(\mathrm{Lt}(g_i))$ are disjoint. Therefore, by Lemma 3.6 we are done.

Let X be generic symmetric. Once we choose the correct monomial order, the rest of the proof is similar to the generic case. Suppose that $(i, j) = (n-1, n)$. We choose the lexicographic monomial order given by the following ordering among the variables:

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 > y_n > y_{n-1} > \cdots > y_2 &> x_{n-1,n-1} > x_{n-1,n} > x_{1,n-1} > x_{2,n-1} > \cdots > x_{n-2,n-1} \\ &> x_{nn} \\ &> x_{1n} > \cdots > x_{n-2,n} \\ &> x_{st} \quad \text{for all other } s, t. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that $(i, j) \neq (n-1, n)$. We choose the lexicographic monomial order given by the following ordering among the variables:

$$\begin{aligned} y_n > y_{n-1} > \cdots > y_1 &> x_{ii} > x_{ij} > x_{1i} > x_{2i} > \cdots > x_{i-1,i} > x_{i,i+1} > \cdots > x_{in} \\ &> x_{jj} > \cdots > x_{j-1,j} > x_{j,j+1} > \cdots > x_{jn} \\ &> x_{st} \quad \text{for all other } s, t. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.3. *Let X be generic and $i < j$. Then, $(I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i\rangle : g_j) = \langle x_{i1}, \ldots, x_{in}\rangle$. If X is generic symmetric and $i < j$, then $(I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i\rangle : g_j) = \langle x_{1i}, \ldots, x_{i-1,i}, x_{ii}, \ldots, x_{in}\rangle$.*

Proof. X be generic. We have $x_{it}g_j = x_{jt}g_i + \sum_{k=1}^{n}(x_{it}x_{jk} - x_{ik}x_{jt})y_k$. Hence, $\langle x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{in}\rangle \subseteq (I_2(\widetilde{X_{ij}}) + \langle g_i\rangle : g_j)$. Moreover, $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i\rangle \subseteq \langle x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{in}\rangle$ and $g_j \notin \langle x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{in}\rangle$. The ideal $\langle x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{in}\rangle$ being a prime ideal, it follows that $\langle x_{i1}, \cdots, x_{in}\rangle \supseteq (I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i\rangle : g_j)$. The proof for the generic symmetric case is similar. □

5. Resolution of the sum ideals

Our aim is to construct a minimal free resolution for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_n\rangle$. We have proved that the ideals $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij})$ and $\langle g_i\rangle$ intersect transversally; see 4.2. The ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i\rangle$ can therefore be resolved minimally by Theorem 3.7. We have also proved that the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i\rangle$ and the ideal $\langle g_j\rangle$ have linear quotient; see 4.3. Therefore, the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j\rangle$ can be resolved by the mapping cone construction. A minimal free resolution can then be extracted from this resolution by applying Lemma 3.12. Next, we will show that the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j\rangle$ intersects transversally with the ideal $\langle g_{l_1}\rangle$, if l_1 is the minimum in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i, j\}$; see Lemma 5.4. Therefore, the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j, g_{l_1}\rangle$ can be resolved minimally by Theorem 3.7. Proceeding in this manner, we will be able to show that the ideals $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j, g_{l_1}, \ldots, g_{l_k}\rangle$ and $\langle g_{l_{k+1}}\rangle$ intersect transversally, if $1 \leq l_1 < \ldots < l_k < l_{k+1} \leq n$ and l_{k+1} is the smallest in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i, j, l_1, \ldots, l_k\}$; see Lemma 5.4. This finally gives us a minimal free resolution for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j, g_{l_1}, \ldots, g_{l_{n-2}}\rangle$, with $1 \leq l_1 < \ldots < l_{n-2} \leq n$ and $l_t \notin \{i, j\}$ for every t.

Let us assume that X is generic and $i = 1$ and $j = 2$. The proofs for the general i and j, with $i < j$ would be similar according to the aforesaid scheme. The proofs in the case when X is generic symmetric would be similar as well. Comments for general $i < j$ and the symmetric case have been made whenever necessary.

5.1. **A minimal free resolution for $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, g_2\rangle$.** The minimal free resolution of $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12})$ is given by the Eagon-Northcott complex, which is the following:

$$\mathbb{E}_\cdot : 0 \longrightarrow E_{n-1} \longrightarrow \cdots E_k \xrightarrow{\delta_k} E_{k-1} \longrightarrow \cdots E_1 \longrightarrow E_0 \longrightarrow R/I_2(\widetilde{X}) \longrightarrow 0$$

where $E_0 \cong R^1$, $E_k = R^{k\binom{n}{k+1}}$ and for each $k = 0, \ldots, n-2$, the map $\delta_k : E_k \to E_{k-1}$ is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_k\left((e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}) \otimes v_2^{k-1}\right) &= \sum_{s=1}^{k+1} x_{2s}(e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e_s} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}) \otimes v_2^{k-2} \\
\delta_k\left((e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}) \otimes v_1^{k-1}\right) &= \sum_{s=1}^{k+1} (-1)^{s+1} x_{1s}(e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e_s} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}) \otimes v_1^{k-2} \\
\delta_k\left((e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}\right) \otimes v_1^j v_2^{k-j-1}) &= \sum_{s=1}^{k+1} (-1)^{s+1} x_{1s}(e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e_s} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}) \otimes v_1^{j-1} v_2^{k-j-1} \\
&\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{k+1} x_{2s}(e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e_s} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}) \otimes v_1^j v_2^{k-j-2}
\end{aligned}$$

for every ordered $k+1$ tuple $(i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_{k+1})$, with $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_{k+1} \leq n$ and for every $j = 1, 2, \cdots, k-2$.

A minimal resolution of $\langle g_1\rangle$ is given by:

$$\mathbb{G}_\cdot : 0 \longrightarrow R \xrightarrow{g_1} R \longrightarrow R/\langle g_1\rangle \longrightarrow 0.$$

The ideals $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12})$ and $\langle g_1\rangle$ intersect transversally, by Lemma 4.2. Therefore, by Lemma 3.7, a minimal free resolution for $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1\rangle$ is given by the tensor product complex

$$\mathbb{E}_\cdot \otimes \mathbb{G}_\cdot : 0 \to E_{n-1} \to \cdots \to E_{k+1} \oplus E_k \xrightarrow{\psi_{k+1}} E_k \oplus E_{k-1} \to \cdots \to E_0 \to R/I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1\rangle \to 0$$

such that $\psi_k : E_k \oplus E_{k-1} \longrightarrow E_{k-1} \oplus E_{k-2}$ is the map defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi_k\left(e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}\right) \otimes v_1^j v_2^{k-j-1} &= \delta_k\left((e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_{k+1}}) \otimes v_1^j v_2^{k-j-1}\right) \\
\psi_k\left(e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_k}\right) \otimes v_1^j v_2^{k-j-2} &= (-1)^{k-1} g_1\left((e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_k}) \otimes v_1^j v_2^{k-j-2}\right) \\
&\quad + \delta_{k-1}\left((e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_k}) \otimes v_1^j v_2^{k-j-2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Now we find a minimal free resolution for $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, g_2\rangle$ by mapping cone. Let $C_k := (\mathbb{E}_\cdot \otimes \mathbb{G}_\cdot)_k$. We have proved in Lemma 4.3 that $\langle I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1\rangle : g_2\rangle = \langle x_{11}, x_{12}, \cdots, x_{1n}\rangle$; which is minimally resolved by the Koszul

complex. Let us denote the Koszul Complex by $(\mathbb{F}_\cdot; \sigma_k)$, where σ_k is the k-th differential. We first construct the connecting map $\tau_\cdot : \mathbb{F}_\cdot \to \mathbb{E}_\cdot \otimes \mathbb{G}_\cdot$. Let us write $F_k := R^{\binom{n}{k}}$ and $C_k := R^{k\binom{n}{k+1}} \oplus R^{(k-1)\binom{n}{k}}$. The map $\tau_k : F_k \to C_k$ is defined as:

$$\tau_k\left(e_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{i_k}\right) = \sum_j y_j(e_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{i_k}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-1} - (e_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{i_k})\otimes v_1^{k-2}.$$

Let us choose the lexicographic ordering among the k tuples $(i_1, \ldots, i_k)$, such that $1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq n$ in order to write an ordered basis for $R^{\binom{n}{k}}$. We define lexicographic ordering among the tuples $(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1}, k-j, j)$, for $j = 0, \ldots, k$ and $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$ to order the basis elements for $R^{k\binom{n}{k+1}}$. Moreover, in the free module $C_k = R^{k\binom{n}{k+1}} \oplus R^{(k-1)\binom{n}{k}}$, we order the basis elements in such a way that those for $R^{k\binom{n}{k+1}}$ appear first. The matrix representation of τ_k with respect to the chosen ordered bases is the following:

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{A}_{k\binom{n}{k+1}\times\binom{n}{k}} & \mathbf{0}_{k\binom{n}{k+1}\times\binom{n}{k}} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{(k-1)\binom{n}{k}\times\binom{n}{k}} & \left(\begin{array}{c} -\mathbf{I}_{\binom{n}{k}\times\binom{n}{k}} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{(k-2)\binom{n}{k}\times\binom{n}{k}} \end{array}\right) \end{array}\right).$$

Theorem 5.1. *The following diagram commutes for every $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_k & \xrightarrow{\tau_k} & C_k \\ {\scriptstyle\sigma_{k+1}}\uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle\psi_{k+1}} \\ F_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\tau_{k+1}} & C_{k+1} \end{array}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the statement for a basis element $(e_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{i_{k+1}})$ of F_{k+1}. Without loss of generality we consider $(e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k+1})$. We first compute $(\tau_k \circ \sigma_{k+1})(e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k+1})$.

$$\begin{aligned} (e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k+1}) &\overset{\sigma_{k+1}}{\longmapsto} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}(e_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e_j} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k+1}) \\ &\overset{\tau_k}{\longmapsto} \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}[\sum_{s=1}^{n} y_s(e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e_j} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k+1} \wedge e_s) \otimes v_1^{k-1}] \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}(e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{e_j} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k+1}) \otimes v_1^{k-2}. \end{aligned}$$

We now compute $(\psi_{k+1}\circ\tau_{k+1})(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1})$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}) \overset{\tau_{k+1}}{\longmapsto} & \sum_{s=1}^{n} y_s(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^k \\
& -(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1})\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
\overset{\psi_{k+1}}{\longmapsto} & \sum_{s=1}^{n}[\sum_{j=1,2,\cdots,k+1,s}(-1)^{j+1}y_s x_{1j}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -(-1)^k g_1(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-2} \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\sum_{s=1}^{n}[x_{1j}y_s(-1)^{j+1}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^{k-1}] \\
& +\sum_{s=1}^{n}(-1)^{s+1}y_s x_{1s}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_s}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -(-1)^k g_1(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-2} \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\sum_{s=1}^{n}[x_{1j}y_s(-1)^{j+1}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^{k-1}] \\
& +\sum_{s=1}^{n}(-1)^{s+1}(-1)^{k+1-s}y_s x_{1s}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_s}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -(-1)^k g_1(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-2} \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\sum_{s=1}^{n}[x_{1j}y_s(-1)^{j+1}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^{k-1}] \\
& +(-1)^k g_1(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -(-1)^k g_1(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-1} \\
& -\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}(e_1\wedge e_2\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-2} \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{k+1}\sum_{s=1}^{n}[x_{1j}y_s(-1)^{j+1}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_s)\otimes v_1^{k-1}] \\
& -\sum_{j=1}^{k+1}(-1)^{j+1}x_{1j}(e_1\wedge\cdots\wedge\hat{e_j}\wedge\cdots\wedge e_{k+1}\wedge e_j)\otimes v_1^{k-2}. \quad \square
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence the mapping cone $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{E}_\cdot \otimes \mathbb{G}_\cdot; \mathbb{F}_\cdot)$ gives us the resolution for $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ as described in 3.2. However, this resolution is not minimal. We now construct a minimal free resolution from $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{E}_\cdot \otimes \mathbb{G}_\cdot; \mathbb{F}_\cdot)$.

A free resolution for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, g_2 \rangle$ has been constructed in 3.1, which is given by

$$0 \longrightarrow D_{n+2} \xrightarrow{d_{n+2}} D_{n+1} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_{k+1}} D_k \xrightarrow{d_k} D_{k-1} \cdots \longrightarrow D_1 \longrightarrow D_0 \longrightarrow 0,$$

such that $D_k = F_{k-1} \oplus C_k = R^{\binom{n}{k-1}} \oplus (R^{k\binom{n}{k+1}} \oplus R^{(k-1)\binom{n}{k}})$ and $d_k = (-\sigma_{k-1} + \tau_{k-1},\ \psi_k)$. Let us recall that the map ψ is the differential in the free resolution for $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1 \rangle$, the map σ is the differential in the Koszul resolution for $\langle x_{11}, x_{12}, \ldots, x_{1n} \rangle$ and τ is the connecting homomorphism between the complexes defined in 3.1. Let us order bases for F_{k-1} and C_k with respect to the lexicographic ordering. Finally we order basis for D_k in such a way that the basis elements for F_{k-1} appear first, followed by the basis elements for C_k. Therefore, the matrix representation for the differential map d_k is given by

$$\left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\sigma_{k-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \tau_{k-1} & \psi_k \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -\sigma_{k-1} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \tau_{k-1} = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} & \left(\begin{array}{c} -\mathbf{I} \\ \hline \mathbf{0} \end{array}\right) \end{array}\right) & \psi_k \end{array}\right).$$

The entries in the matrices representing σ_{k-1} and ψ_k can only belong to the maximal ideal $\langle x_{ij}, y_j \rangle$, since both are differentials of minimal free resolutions. The block matrix A has also elements in the maximal ideal $\langle x_{ij}, y_j \rangle$. The only block which has elements outside the maximal ideal $\langle x_{ij}, y_j \rangle$ is in the identity block appearing in τ_{k-1}. Therefore, it is clear from the matrix representation of the map d_k that we can apply Lemma 3.12 repeatedly to get rid of non-minimality. Hence, we get a minimal free resolution and the

total Betti numbers for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, g_2\rangle$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
b_0 &= 1,\\
b_1 &= \binom{n}{2} + 2,\\
b_2 &= 2\cdot\binom{n}{3} + n,\\
b_{k+1} &= k\binom{n}{k+1} + (k-1)\binom{n}{k} + \binom{n}{k-1} - \binom{n}{k-1} - \binom{n}{k}\\
&= k\binom{n}{k+1} + (k-2)\binom{n}{k}, \quad \text{for} \quad 2 \le k \le n-1,\\
b_n &= n-2.
\end{aligned}$$

5.2. **A minimal free resolution for $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_n\rangle$.**

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\mathcal{G}_k = \mathcal{G}_{12} \cup \{g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_k\}$, $1 \le k \le n$, where $\mathcal{G}_{12}$ is the set of all 2×2 minors of $\widetilde{X}_{12}$ defined in the list of notations in section 2. The set $\mathcal{G}_k$ is a Gröbner basis for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k\rangle$ with respect to a suitable monomial order.*

Proof. We take the lexicographic monomial ordering in R induced by the following ordering among the indeterminates:

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{nn} > \cdots > x_{tt} > \cdots > x_{33} &> y_1 > \cdots > y_n\\
&> x_{11} > \cdots > x_{1n} > x_{21} > \cdots > x_{2n}\\
&> x_{st} \quad \text{for other} \quad s,t.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we observe that for every $s \ge 3$, $\mathrm{Lt}(g_s)$ is coprime with $\mathrm{Lt}(g_t)$ for every $1 \le t \le k$; $t \ne s$ and also coprime with $\mathrm{Lt}(h)$ for every $h \in \mathcal{G}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, $\mathcal{G}_{12}$ is a Gröbner basis for $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12})$. Therefore, we only have test the S-polynomials $S(g_1, g_2)$, $S(g_1, h)$ and $S(g_2, h)$, for $h \in \mathcal{G}$.

We can write $S(g_1, g_2) = \sum_{k=1}^{n}[12|1k]y_k$ and note that $\mathrm{Lt}([12|1k]) \le \mathrm{Lt}(S(g_1, g_2)$ for every $1 \le k \le n$. Hence, $S(g_1, g_2) \to_{\mathcal{G}'} 0$. We note that, if $i \ne 1$ then the leading terms of g_1 and $[12|st]$ are mutually coprime and therefore $S(g_1, [12|st]) \to_{\mathcal{G}_k} 0$. Next, the expression $S(g_1, [12|1t]) = x_{1t}g_2 + \sum_{s\ne t}[12|st]y_s$ shows that $S(g_1, [12|1t]) \to_{\mathcal{G}_k} 0$. Similarly, if $s \ne 1$

then the leading terms of g_2 and $[12|st]$ are mutually coprime and therefore $S(g_2, [12|st]) \to_{\mathcal{G}_k} 0$. The proof for $S(g_2, [12|1t])$ is similar to that of $S(g_1, [12|st])$. □

Remark. The corresponding result for $i < j$ in general would be the following:

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\mathcal{G}_{i,j,k} = \mathcal{G}_{ij} \cup \{g_i, g_j, g_{l_1}, \ldots, g_{l_{k-2}}\}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $1 \leq l_1 < \cdots < l_{k-2} \leq n$ and l_t is the smallest in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i, j, l_1, \ldots, l_{t-1}\}$; $\mathcal{G}_{ij}$ denotes the set of all 2×2 minors of $\widetilde{X}_{ij}$ defined in the list of notations in section 2. The set $\mathcal{G}_{i,j,k}$ is a Gröbner basis for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle$ with respect to a suitable monomial order.*

Proof. While proving this statement with $i < j$ arbitrary, we have to choose the following monomial orders. The rest of the proof remains similar.

Suppose that X is generic, we choose the lexicographic monomial ordering in R induced by the following ordering among the indeterminates:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{nn} > \cdots > \widehat{x_{jj}} > \cdots > \widehat{x_{ii}} > \cdots > x_{11} &> y_1 > \cdots > y_n \\ &> x_{i1} > \cdots > x_{in} \\ &> x_{j1} > \cdots > x_{jn} \\ &> x_{st} \quad \text{for all other} \quad s, t. \end{aligned}$$

If X is generic symmetric, we choose the lexicographic monomial ordering in R induced by the following ordering among the indeterminates:

$$\begin{aligned} x_{nn} > \cdots > \widehat{x_{jj}} > \cdots > \widehat{x_{ii}} > \cdots > x_{11} > y_1 > \cdots > y_n \\ > x_{ii} > x_{ij} > x_{1i} > x_{2i} > \cdots > x_{i-1,i} > x_{i,i+1} > \cdots > x_{in} \\ > x_{jj} > \cdots > x_{j-1,j} > x_{j,j+1} > \cdots > x_{jn} \\ > x_{st} \quad \text{for all other} \quad s, t. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.4. *The ideals $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle$ and $\langle g_{k+1} \rangle$ intersect transversally, for every $2 \leq k \leq n-1$.*

Proof. Suppose not, then, there exists $h_{k+1} \notin I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle$ such that $h_{k+1} g_{k+1} \in I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle$. Let us choose the same monomial order on R as defined in Lemma 5.2. Upon division by elements of $\mathcal{G}_k$, we may further assume that $\mathrm{Lt}(h) \nmid \mathrm{Lt}(h_{k+1})$ for every $h \in \mathcal{G}_k$, since $\mathcal{G}_k$ is a Gröbner basis for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle$ by Lemma 5.2. On the other hand $h_{k+1} g_{k+1} \in I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k \rangle$ and therefore $\mathrm{Lt}(h) \mid \mathrm{Lt}(h_{k+1})$, for some $h \in \mathcal{G}_k$, since $\mathrm{Lt}(h)$ and $\mathrm{Lt}(g_{k+1})$ are mutually coprime, - a contradiction. □

Remark. The corresponding result for $i < j$ in general would be the following: The ideals $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_i, g_j, g_{l_1}, \ldots, g_{l_k}\rangle$ and $\langle g_{l_{k+1}}\rangle$ intersect transversally, if $1 \leq l_1 < \ldots < l_k < l_{k+1} \leq n$ and l_{k+1} is the smallest in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i, j, l_1, \ldots, l_k\}$, for every $1 \leq k \leq n-3$. The proof is essentially the same as above after we use the Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Part (1) of the theorem has been proved in 5.1. We now prove part (2) under the assumption $i = 1$, $j = 2$. Let the minimal free resolution of $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, g_2, \cdots, g_k\rangle$ be $(\mathbb{L}_\cdot, \delta_\cdot)$. By Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 3.7, the minimal free resolution of $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_{k+1}\rangle$ is given by the tensor product of $(\mathbb{L}_\cdot, \delta_\cdot)$ and $0 \longrightarrow R \xrightarrow{g_{k+1}} R \longrightarrow 0$, and that is precisely $(\mathbb{K}_\cdot, \Delta_\cdot)$, with $K_p = L_p \oplus L_{p-1}$ and $\Delta_p = (\lambda_p, (-1)^p g_{k+1} + \lambda_{p-1})$. Let $\beta_{k,p}$, $0 \leq p \leq n+k$, denote the p-th total Betti number for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_k\rangle$. Then, the total Betti numbers $\beta_{k+1,p}$, $0 \leq p \leq n+k+1$ for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{12}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_{k+1}\rangle$ are given by $\beta_{k+1,0} = 1$, $\beta_{k+1,p} = \beta_{k,p-1} + \beta_{k,p}$ for $1 \leq p \leq n+k$ and $\beta_{k+1,n+k+1} = n-2$. The proof for general $i < j$ follows similarly according to the strategy discussed in the beginning of section 5.

In particular, the total Betti number $\beta_{n-2,p}$ for the ideal $I_2(\widetilde{X}_{ij}) + \langle g_1, \ldots, g_n\rangle$ are given by $\beta_{n-2,0} = 1$, $\beta_{n-2,p} = \beta_{n-3,p-1} + \beta_{n-3,p}$ for $1 \leq p \leq 2n-3$ and $\beta_{n-2,2n-2} = n-2$. □

Example. We show the Betti numbers at each stage for $n = 4$ and $n = 5$.

$$n = 4: \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} & & 1 & 6 & 8 & 3 & & & \\ & & 1 & 7 & 14 & 11 & 3 & & \\ & & 1 & 8 & 12 & 7 & 2 & & \\ & & 1 & 9 & 20 & 19 & 9 & 2 & \\ & & 1 & 10 & 29 & 39 & 28 & 11 & 2 \end{array}$$

$$n = 5: \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 1 & 10 & 20 & 5 & 4 & & & & \\ 1 & 11 & 30 & 25 & 9 & 4 & & & \\ 1 & 12 & 25 & 25 & 14 & 3 & & & \\ 1 & 13 & 37 & 50 & 39 & 17 & 3 & & \\ 1 & 14 & 50 & 87 & 89 & 56 & 20 & 3 & \\ 1 & 15 & 64 & 137 & 176 & 145 & 76 & 23 & 3 \end{array}$$

REFERENCES

[1] W. Bruns, A.R. Kustin, M. Miller, The Resolution of the Generic Residual Intersection of a Complete Intersection, *Journal of Algebra* 128 (1990) 214-239.

[2] A. Conca, Emanuela De Negri, Elisa Gorla, Universal Gröbner bases for Maximal Minors, *International Mathematics Research Notices* 11(2015) 3245-3262.

[3] D. Eisenbud, *Geometry of Syzygies,* Springer-Verlag, NY, 2005.
[4] P. Gimenez, I. Sengupta and H. Srinivasan, Minimal graded free resolution for monomial curves defined by arithmetic sequences, *Journal of Algebra* 388 (2013) 294-310.
[5] M.R., Johnson, J. McLoud-Mann, On equations defining Veronese Rings, *Arch. Math. (Basel)* 86(3)(2006) 205-210.
[6] S.Lichtenbaum, On the vanishing of Tor in regular local rings, *Illinois J.Math.* 10: 220- 226,1966.
[7] H. Matsumura, *Commutative Ring Theory*, Cambridge University Press, NY, 1986.
[8] I. Peeva, *Graded Syzygies*, Springer-Verlag London Limited, 2011.
[9] J. Saha, I. Sengupta, G. Tripathi, Ideals of the form $I_1(XY)$, *arXiv:1609.02765 [math.AC]* 2016.
[10] J. Saha, I. Sengupta, G. Tripathi, Primality of certain Determinanatal ideals, *arXiv:1610.00926 [math.AC]* 2016.

Department of Mathematics, RKM Vivekananda University, Belur Math, Howrah 711202, India.
E-mail address: saha.joydip56@gmail.com

Discipline of Mathematics, IIT Gandhinagar, Palaj, Gandhinagar, Gujarat 382355, INDIA.
E-mail address: indranathsg@iitgn.ac.in

Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, WB 700 032, India.
E-mail address: gelatinx@gmail.com